



The City Manager  
City of Fredericksburg  
715 Princess Anne Street, Room 203  
P.O. Box 7447  
Fredericksburg, VA 22401

**NOTICE TO BIDDERS  
ADDENDUM 3  
February 16, 2011  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL  
COURTHOUSE AND COURT FACILITIES PPEA DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION  
CONCEPTUAL PHASE**

**CLOSING DATE (NOT CHANGED): March 1, 2011, 4:00 P.M. EST**

This addendum consists of this one (1) cover page and five (5) pages which include questions received to date (since addendum 2 issued) and responses. You must acknowledge receipt of this and all addenda in your proposal.

Except as modified herein, all other terms and conditions of the Request for Proposal remain in full force and effect.

---

Robert K. Antozzi, Ed.D, CPRP  
Director of Parks, Recreation & Public Facilities

---

Date

**QUESTIONS RECEIVED BY FAX/EMAIL January 17, 2011 through February 14, 2011:**

- AD3-1. **Question:** Will all typical City of Fredericksburg design review, permit and connection fees associated with applications for review, public hearings and construction related items (for both the building and the site) be paid for by the design-build contractor, or will the City of Fredericksburg waive all such fees.  
**Response:**
- Building permit fees will be waived
  - Water and sewer availability fees will not be waived
  - Business license fees for contractors and sub-contractors will not be waived.
- AD3-2. **Question:** Recognizing that this project will have a new Circuit Court (which has the authority to hear criminal cases between the State and persons accused of a crime), and that the Virginia Bureau of Capital Outlay Management (BCOM) provides building code, cost and procurement reviews of proposed state agency construction and capital outlay projects, will a BCOM design review be required?  
**Response:** none anticipated.
- AD3-3. **Question:** Is combined domestic/fire water service acceptable to feed a building with the separation of domestic and fire occurring within the building mechanical room(s)? Or are separate domestic and fire services required with separate taps in the street or at least separate isolation valves at the property line?  
**Response:** Please consult applicable Virginia Building Codes.
- AD3-4. **Question:** Is a double check valve assembly an acceptable backflow prevention device? Or is a reduced pressure zone device required in the fire service?  
**Response:** Please consult applicable Virginia Building Codes.
- AD3-5. **Question:** If a standpipe system is required for a building because of height, but the building is not classified as a high-rise structure and the building is fully sprinklered, may the combined sprinkler/standpipe system be a "manual wet" system that depends on the fire department pumping apparatus to supply standpipe valve/hose pressure? If it may be "manual wet," the fire pump and water service will be sized to supply only the automatic sprinkler system's pressure and flow needs as the first response to a fire or no fire pump will be installed if street pressure is adequate to supply the sprinkler system.  
**Response:** Please consult applicable Virginia Building Codes.
- AD3-6. **Question:** Section 14.2.1 Volume 1 – Qualifications and Experience states the order in which information is to be submitted, with Attachments C & D, Past Projects for Contractor & Architect/Engineer to be provided in Tabs F and G. However, Attachments C&D are also to be included as part of Attachment B for c) preferred construction experience, d) preferred design experience, and e) design/build team experience, as stated on page 16 of 23 of the RFP. Can we simply make reference on Attachment B that the forms are located in Tabs F & G, or do we need to duplicate the information?  
**Response:** Per page 16 of 23, section B.1. c. d. and e. state to "Provide on Attachments C", "D", and "C and D." You may reference on Attachment B where the forms are if desired. No duplication is requested. The intent of Attachment B, Section B.1 was to explain where we would be looking for information to support your Project Performance experience. See answer to question AD3-7 below.

- AD3-7. **Question (Clarification on Question AD3-6 above):** Please clarify and advise as to where in Volume I we are to provide Attachments C & D.  
**Response:** Per page 12 of 23 section 14.2.1, please provide Attachment C at 14.2.1.F and Attachment D at 14.2.1.G.
- AD3-8. **Question:** On page #3 of the RFP, Item 1.7.10 indicates that we are to “Include all relocation costs for existing tenants (of at least \$18/SF)”. Please clarify if:
- The \$18/SF was intended to be a lease rate that we are to assume for relocated tenants in lieu of relocation costs for tenants that will be displaced due to this RFP response?
- Response:** The \$18/SF is intended to be the cost per square feet of leased space for any City offices that need to be relocated to serve your proposal.
- AD3-9. **Question:** On page #3 of the RFP, Item 1.7.10 indicates that we are to “Include all relocation costs for existing tenants (of at least \$18/SF)”. Please clarify if:
- Is the \$18/SF truly a relocation cost that we are to carry to facilitate movement of equipment / furniture / files / etc. for all entities that will be relocated to any new facility that is built as a result of this RFP? We are asking for this clarification as the \$18/SF appears to be inflated for purely relocation.
- Response:** Yes. Only use the \$18/SF to calculate relocation costs. Using this consistent unit cost will allow comparison between proposals.
- AD3-10. **Question:** Please confirm that the document regarding space usage for the Executive Plaza (as found on the project FTP site) is a fairly accurate depiction of current usage – especially the numbers indicated for the first floor.  
**Response:** The document in question is recent and considered an accurate document, including the first floor.
- AD3-11. **Question:** We would like to visit the Circuit Courthouse to familiarize all of our team members with this building. Please let me know if we may do so and how we should go about making arrangements.  
**Response:** Steve Bowling, Public Facility Supervisor, will make the arrangements for a tour. You may email him directly, but please copy me. He needs some time periods that make sense for you, and then he will check with the Court for availability. On some days, court precludes a tour of the courtroom; hence more than one day would be helpful.
- AD3-12. **Question:** At the time of a feasibility study about five years ago, the city was considering measures to address the moisture infiltration problems at the Circuit Courthouse foundation walls. Has that work ever been done? If so, what were the results?  
**Response:** A number of issues have contributed to the infiltration of moisture, the most obvious and realistic remedies of which were employed and completed during the summer of 2010. Since that time, the moisture issue appears to have been arrested.
- AD3-13. **Question:** Also at the time of the feasibility study, there was discussion of making repairs to the existing windows at the Circuit Courthouse, including installation of double glazing. Were such repairs ever made?  
**Response:** Repairs to the windows and associated wood have been made. However, all windows remain single pane.
- AD3-14. **Question:** Does the city have any hazardous materials reports on the Circuit Courthouse? Were hazmats, mold, and/or indoor air quality factors in moving the Circuit Court Clerk out of the building?

**Response:** The only issue was mold. Numerous air quality tests were taken with no apparent threat. Due to obvious significant mold in the jury room, mold on the court room ceiling tiles, the entire second floor was cleaned, sanitized and painted as appropriate. Post air quality tests demonstrated mold at non significant levels. No signs of mold have recurred. While no mold issues were associated with the first floor, the clerk operation was temporarily relocated to allow cleaning and modest renovation.

AD3-15. **Question:** We would appreciate a clarification of RFP paragraph 1.7.10. Is the \$18/SF referring to rent for leased space, or to one-time tenant fit up costs, or to something else?

**Response:** The \$18/SF is intended to be the cost per square feet of leased space for any City offices that need to be relocated to serve your proposal. Only use the \$18/SF to calculate relocation costs. See AD3-9 above.

AD3-16. **Question:** In Scheme 2, who would be responsible for the cost of relocating Drug Court, and if it is the City should we include an ongoing annual lease cost for that?

**Response:** Drug Court needs to be part of the equation and space identified. However, it does not need to be in the courthouse

AD3-17. **Question:** Follow-up to Question AD3-18. Would the City be responsible for that cost, i.e., providing space for it elsewhere such as leased space?

**Response:** Yes, the City would be responsible for providing space for the Drug Court Program. And yes, as a last option, the City would lease space.

AD3-18. **Question:** We believe the recently constructed hotel at Caroline and Charlotte Streets probably has soil conditions similar to the two court sites under consideration. Would the city's building official have construction drawings showing the foundations for the hotel, and if so how could we obtain that information? It would be helpful in developing project costs.

**RESPONSE from City's building official:** We do have the plans but I believe that the engineering data that would be most helpful is in Mr. Thomas Mitchell's (hotel's owner) possession. We do not have the soil bearing information in our files.

AD3-19. **Question:** The RFP provides an outline for proposal content but also refers to the city's PPEA guidelines for content requirements. The outline in the guidelines is somewhat different than the one in the RFP. It appears that the specific items in the RFP outline for the most part could fall under one of the items in the guidelines. For example, the Space Program Matrix required by the RFP could fall under item ii(a) on page 13 of the guidelines, i.e., as part of the description of the project . The question is, does the city want us to structure the proposal to correspond item for item to the outline in the guidelines, incorporating the information required by the RFP under the appropriate heading, or should we blend the two outlines together to create a combined outline that is different from both of them?

**Response:** Structure your proposal following the format as stated in the RFP Section 14.2. Address all Mandatory Criteria (section 8) and Evaluation Factors (section 9) as necessary within this format.

AD3-20. **Question:** Please provide the total operating cost of the entire executive plaza site (i.e. utilities, insurance, maintenance, trash, repairs, etc.)

**Response:** The information below is provided as the best current answer to your question, but is not considered complete. The pro rata cost for insurance is an

example of what is not included. Providing estimates for any gaps in the total operating cost with a rationale for assigning those numbers should suffice.

1. Contracted Services:		
a. ThyssenKrupp Elevator: PM and Inspection Services		\$5,157.00
b. NEIS: Mandated Independent Elevator Inspection services		\$60.00
c. Virginia Sprinkler Co: Annual Standpipe Test & Inspection		\$730.00
d. Fire Safety Systems: Annual Fire Extinguisher Inspection and service.		\$474.00
e. Edington Air: HVAC semi-annual PM		<u>\$1,700.00</u>
	<b>Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$8,121.00</b>
2. Custodial Services:		
a. Manpower: PRPF Custodian, 30 hours per week, 52 weeks per year At \$11.23 per hour, unencumbered		\$17,519.00
b. Custodial Supplies: Based on 29,600 sq ft of occupied and common area space x \$.27 per sq ft average cost per year		\$7,500.00
c. Custodial Equipment: Not factored into annual cost. Considers use of equipment on hand without replacement cost or depreciation.		<u>\$ -0-</u>
	<b>Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$25,018.00</b>
3. Repair & Maintenance:		
a. Manpower: PFPF Staff: 60 Work Requests annually at average 2 hours each = 120 manhours at estimated average encumbered hourly rate of \$30 per hour.		\$3,600.00
b. Parts, Supplies & Materials		<u>\$2,274.00</u>
	<b>Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$5,874.00</b>
4. Utilities:		
a. Dominion Virginia Power (electricity)		\$53,517.00
b. City of Fredericksburg Treasurer, Water & Sewer		<u>\$1,583.00</u>
	<b>Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$55,100.00</b>
	<b>Grand Total, Operational</b>	<b>\$94,113.00</b>

**Projects:**

1. Roof Replacement:	
a. Engineering Services	\$16,095.00
b. Sanger Roofing	\$128,000.00
c. Lightning Suppression	\$17,863.00
d. HVAC Replacements & Modifications:	<u>* \$35,979.00</u>

\*HVAC costs will increase due to change

orders issued during the project.

	<b>Sub-Total:</b>	<b>197,937.00</b>
2. 5th and 6th Floor Build-out		<u>\$120,000.00</u>
	<b>Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$120,000.00</b>

**Grand Total Projects: \$317,937.00**

AD3-21. **Question:** Does the City receive any income or rent from any of the existing tenants in this building?

**Response:** There is one tenant in the building who leases the space.

AD3-22. **Question:** Are any of the tenants charged for parking?

**Response:** No building tenants pay for parking.

AD3-23. **Question:** Can you tell me the rent that Court Services pays annually?

**Response:** The annual amount is \$62,854.32.

AD3-24. **Question:** Are there currently plans in the works to occupy the only remaining vacant space in EP?

**Response:** There are "plans" to occupy all remaining vacant space, excluding suite 102 between Registrar and Parking Office (1822sf), but the plans have not been executed. Hence, they will remain empty until such time I am told to take the plans forward.

**ATTACHMENTS TO ADDENDUM:** None

The above information shall be issued for inclusion in Addendum #3. If any participant has a correction please email Warren Walker, ARCADIS at [warren.walker@arcadis-us.com](mailto:warren.walker@arcadis-us.com).